DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 794 SO 000 135

AUTHOR	Knight, Merle M.; Hodges, James O.
TITLE	Curriculum Materials Analysis System; A Summary of Experience.
INSTITUTION	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 70
NOTE	8p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 970 Aurora Ave., Boulder, Colorado 80302 (Single copies, free; Multiple copies, $ .10 each)
JOURNAL CIT	Social Science Education Consortium Newsletter; n7 p1-8 May 1969
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Design, Curriculum Development, *Curriculum Evaluation, Curriculum Planning, Curriculum Research, *Evaluation Techniques, *Instructional Materials, Program Evaluation, *Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS	CMAS, *Curriculum Materials Analysis System

ABSTRACT

The purposes of this Newsletter are: to summarize the Consortium's recent experience with the Curriculum Materials Analysis System (CMAS); to report the activities of others using CMAS; and to describe available analyses of curriculum materials, including their prices. Most of the analyses were done by teachers and supervisors in work groups receiving some assistance from Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC) staff members. CMAS was originally developed by SSEC directors Irving Morrissett and W. W. Stevens, Jr. primarily for evaluating new social studies project materials. A summary of the complete CMAS is included. The six major sections are: Descriptive Characteristics, Rationale and Ojectives, Antecedent Conditions, Content, Instructional Theory and Teaching Strategies, and Overall Judgments. The materials covered by the 43 analyses range from anthropology to sociology, for grades 1 to 12. (DJB)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
IRVING MORRISSETT
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SSEC Social Science Education Consortium
NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 7 MAY, 1969

ED041794

CURRICULUM MATERIALS ANALYSIS SYSTEM: A Summary of Experience

MERLE M. KNIGHT and JAMES O. HODGES

Messers. Knight and Hodges are Staff Associates with the Social Science Education Consortium and Visiting Lecturers at the University of Colorado. Knight was previously associated with The Education Council of Long Island, New York. His teaching experience has been with the Pine Bluff Schools, Arkansas. Hodges was previously Coordinator of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program in economics at Purdue University and taught at the junior and senior high school levels in Amarillo, Texas.

The purposes of this *Newsletter* are threefold: They are 1) to summarize the Consortium's recent activities related to the Curriculum Materials Analysis System (CMAS); 2) to share our knowledge about the activities of others using the CMAS; and 3) to describe available analyses of curriculum materials and publish a price list for them. Most of the analyses were done by teachers and supervisors in work groups receiving some assistance from SSEC staff members.

This *Newsletter* is a step toward one of the major goals of the SSEC—the dissemination of analytical and usable knowledge about new curriculum materials, particularly but not exclusively from the major social studies projects.

By way of background, in the early and mid-1960's over forty social science curriculum projects began work on materials to be included in the school curriculum. A number of outstanding university scholars, both social scientists and educationists, have participated in this endeavor. At present some innovative publishers have marketed or have plans to market many of the materials developed by the projects.

The impact of the "new social studies" is upon us. Within the next few years conscientious administrators and teachers must decide which of the new curriculum materials, if any, can best meet the needs of pupils in their schools. This decision will include what kinds of materials to use, the type of teacher training needed to insure desirable outcomes, and what types of classrooms, libraries, and other facilities are needed.

In an effort to facilitate the task before school administrators and teachers, the SSEC has established at Boulder a library of documents and materials, both published and unpublished, from the social science projects. The library is used by visitors from all parts of the nation and from abroad. It also serves as the resource center for descriptive and analytical information compiled and distributed by the SSEC. Descriptive information has been published from time to time in the *SSEC Newsletter*. Analytical information is being made available for the first time through this issue of the *Newsletter* in the form of analyses presented in the format of the Curriculum Materials Analysis System developed by Irving Morrissett and W. W. Stevens, Jr. of the SSEC staff.

SO 000 135

Evaluation for Dissemination

Many more analyses have been produced than are being made available for distribution. There are two reasons why all of the analyses are not being distributed: 1) some of the analyses were very similar to each other, partially as a result of workshops using old analyses as a point of departure, and 2) many of the analyses are inadequate because they were done in short workshops, sometimes with very limited training provided, and often with the emphasis on education of the participants rather than production of finished analyses.

Why a Curriculum Materials Analysis System?

The new social studies materials and ideas reflect the growing concern of the educational community that the social studies programs of the nation's schools have not incorporated the increasing knowledge of the social sciences. These projects have attempted to upgrade the quantity and quality of social sciences found in the elementary and secondary social studies materials; they have been financed mainly by grants from the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Office of Education, and private foundations.

These curriculum research and reform projects have had two major thrusts. On the one hand, they are much more strongly oriented to the content of the social sciences than are the usual social studies efforts, and competent professional social scientists have been deeply involved in the creation of the new materials. On the other hand, educators participating in the projects have had the time and resources to incorporate in the materials a greater variety of activities and processes reflecting new knowledge about teaching strategies and learning theories than had previously been possible. If the new materials are clearly understood by the educational practitioner, they can have a significant impact upon the teaching of social studies in the nation's schools and upon the students who are educated with the help of these new materials.

As each of these projects comes to a conclusion, this rapidly expanding pool of curriculum materials and ideas will make the job of finding the right combination for a particular school easier and at the same time more difficult. If the school can determine its needs, it may find that a particular curriculum package or combination of packages will fill those needs. However, the job of selection becomes more difficult as the number and types of curricula continue to expand. The problem facing the schools of the nation is how to gain current and relevant information about these materials. Professional education journals have made some attempt to inform the public, but the information has not been adequately structured to make the materials understandable and easily compared. The educational practitioner needs much more information about the new materials and ideas than has been available up to now.

The CMAS in Brief

At its present stage of development, the Curriculum Materials Analysis System consists of six major sections. They are:

1.0 *Descriptive Characteristics.* This section calls for the analyst to describe the salient characteristics of the curriculum materials. Responses are elicited to questions concerning materials available, sources of materials, teaching time required, style, money cost, performance data availability, etc.

2.0 *Rationale and Objectives* is a category that calls for the analysis of two related areas. The analyst determines why the materials were developed, including the criteria for selection and ordering of content and processes. He also discovers the expected outcomes of the material, both general and specific.

3.0 *Antecedent Conditions.* This section specifies the particular conditions in which the materials are most suitable or are most likely to be successful. The conditions refer to types of students, teachers, administrations, school facilities, and communities.

4.0 *Content* deals with all the hoped-for changes in the knowledge, attitudes, and behavior of the students.

5.0 *Instructional Theory and Teaching Strategies.* This section provides the analyst with guides to analyze the implicit and/or explicit learnin theory on which the curriculum materials are based. The analyst also seeks the relationship between learning theory and the teaching strategies which are specified in the program.

6.0 *Overall Judgments* is a section which calls for the reporting of evaluations made by other users of the materials, by other analysts who have looked at the materials, and by the analyst himself. To this point the analyst has been reporting his analytical observations; now he is asked to evaluate.

A brief summary outline of the CMAS is included in this *Newsletter.* The more elaborate version, a fourteen-page document in outline form, is found on the price list and may be ordered from the Social Science Education Consortium.

Two articles have previously been published that explain the present analysis system. "A Curriculum Analysis System" by W. Williams Stevens, Jr. and William Fetsko appeared in the February, 1968 *SSEC Newsletter.* "A System for Analyzing Social Science Curricula" by Stevens and Irving Morrissett was printed in *EPIE Forum,* December, 1967-January, 1968. Reprints of both are available from the SSEC.

At the present the CMAS is in the process of revision. Over the years the system has been changed and modified, with many individuals throughout the country contributing to those changes. A major revision was made following a Curriculum Analysis Conference held at Purdue University in February, 1967. In April, 1968 the analysis system was subjected to an intensive critique by personnel from eight regional educational laboratories at a five-day conference at Boulder. In addition, various users of the system have suggested revisions. All these suggestions are being considered carefully as the current revision is made.

Experience With the System

The CMAS has aroused considerable interest among school personnel all over the country. Several thousand copies of it, in various forms, have found their way into the hands of curriculum committees, college classrooms, and other groups studying curriculum materials and making curriculum decisions.

The system has been discussed at numerous meetings and has been used in many workshops and institutes. Some examples: A two-day clinic in curriculum analysis was conducted at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies in November, 1967. Analyses of social studies project materials have been produced in Title III centers, workshops held by school systems, summer institutes, and Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs. Title III centers and school systems which have produced analyses include Project Future, Watsonville, California; Wabash Valley Education Center, Lafayette, Indiana; Metropolitan Area Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon; Marin Social Studies Project, Marin County, California; Tucson, Arizona; and Baltimore County, Maryland. Extensive use was made of the system and many analyses were produced by the participants of the Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs at Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana and the University of Colorado at Boulder. The Carnegie-Mellon NDEA History Institute for Curriculum Specialists examined the system and produced some analyses. An NDEA Institute in Economic Education Curriculum Materials Analysis was held for one week each in fi ve cities across the United States in the Summer of 1968 resulting in a number of analyses of economics materials. Approximately 150 analyses have been produced to date covering some 32 social studies projects and eight commercially available textbooks.

Principal Uses of the System

The experiences that the Consortium and others have had with the System can be grouped into four major categories: 1) curriculum materials development; 2) selection of curriculum materials; 3) classroom implementation, modification, and adaptation of materials; and 4) teacher training.

Curriculum materials developers and those involved in curriculum research find the system useful as a checklist of the many dimensions that must be considered in research and development of curriculum. The categories suggest such aspects as rationale, types of objectives, structure of content, instructional theory, and teaching strategies which curriculum developers may wish to explain more fully in their own materials and which consumers may soon expect or even demand from materials producers. Developers find the analyses useful as a source of information about materials other than their own, and can also profit from third-party analyses of their own materials. An example of a useful exchange of ideas between analyst and curriculum developer is given in the section immediately below.

Those involved in curriculum selection, whether administrators, curriculum committees, or individual teachers, are probably the greatest beneficiaries of an analysis system. An understanding of the analysis system suggests relevant questions which should be asked and answered during any curriculum selection process. The analyses help to provide the answers to many of those questions. If analyses of a number of competing sets of materials are available, they will facilitate comparisons of each of

the major aspects and elements of the various sets.

Classroom teachers who are implementing new materials or who are selecting from and modifying materials are aided in their task by better understanding the materials which have been provided for their use. The system provides both a method for gaining information about the materials before they are used and a framework for organizing observations during classroom use.

Finally, the Curriculum Materials Analysis System is proving useful in teacher training, both pre-service and in-service. The system introduces both students and teachers to new ideas and approaches in curriculum materials and acquaints them with a broad range of curriculum materials through the study of analyses done by others. By using the CMAS to perform their own analyses of curriculum materials the in-service and pre-service teachers become effectively and efficiently involved with all of the elements of curriculum philosophy, development, and use.

Critique of an Analysis

Completion of an analysis of a set of curriculum materials should mark a beginning, not an end. The analysis can serve as a basis for a probing discussion among analysts, curriculum decision-makers, classroom teachers, curriculum developers, and all others interested in the development, understanding, adoption, adaptation, and classroom use of materials.

An example of such an interchange between analysts and a curriculum developer is presented below. The analysts were Elmer Clawson, Jane Lowrie, and Joan Macey, Fellows in the 1968-69 Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program at the University of Colorado. The materials analyzed were produced by the Anthropology Curriculum Project at the University of Georgia for elementary grades. The curriculum developer who commented on the analysis was Marion Rice, Director of the Project.

Analysts:

3.132 *Mental age*—Even though we are using this material with 8-9 year old children, it would appear to be for the average or above students. The vocabulary and reading level appear to be difficult for this age level.

Rice:

The material is difficult, especially the fourth grade unit which has not been revised. However, results are somewhat difficult to interpret for the following reasons: 1) If teachers actually teach the materials rather than just review them, there is much less emphasis on how difficult they are. Since teachers find that pupils have more success than failure in handling the material, they sometimes change their appraisal. 2) Use of the materials with disadvantaged Negro children, in contrast with selected learners, indicates that disadvantaged children acquire many of the concepts, as measured by the tests. 3) Potterfield's study, using the fourth grade unit at the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades, did not show significant increments of achievement as children progressed by grade, i.e., fourth graders did just about as well as sixth graders. Where technical rather than literary material is taught, and both younger and older children have to "learn" the new material, difficulty levels, based on conventional basal reading approaches, may not be nearly as significant.
Revision of the materials should, however, attempt to reduce some of the vocabulary-content load.

Analysts:

3.21 *Formal educational requirements*—The material would require some background in anthropology. No specific requirements are listed by the authors. The authors provide an excellent book, *Teacher Background Material,* as help for the teacher. This material would provide a good base to build from. The *Teacher's Guide* does not contain specific statements of teaching methodology. It does list possible activities for each unit.

Rice:

Prescription of teaching methodology was deemphasized, in view of the assumption that teachers impose on subject matter their own teaching style.
In reexamining the manuals, however, more attention might be given to explicit classroom suggestions, such as techniques of all-pupil participation through paper response concomitant to oral explanation and recitation.

Analysts:

3.23 *Motivational characteristics*—Because of the nature of the subject matter, a teacher without a background in anthropology would need higher than average motivation to work through the materials and to develop a background.

Rice:

Does not any new material require "higher than average motivation" if the teacher is actually to develop the knowledge background we assume to be desired in teaching in any area? Many teachers who use the Anthropology Project materials do not develop this background by using even the limited Teacher Essays provided.
Generally speaking, teachers are no different from other learners and college professors; the general rule is that we tend to work in such a way as to minimize rather than maximize the amount of preparation needed.

Analysts:

4.3 *Psychomotor skills*—This is not an area of concentration that is of concern to the authors. Reading and writing abilities are necessary and normal classroom activities present at each grade level. The curriculum activities are not designed to improve such skills and coordination.

Rice:

We regard reading and writing as highly important skills developed concomitantly with the concepts of anthropology. The pupil workbooks were designed to emphasize these skills, as well as the pupil text.
In the revisions, we will emphasize the importance of reading and writing in anthropology.

After all, these skills are especially important for achievement in view of the cognitive emphasis of these units.

Analysts:

6.3 *Comparisons*

6.32 *With author's intentions*—The materials follow the stated intent of the authors. They are deductive and expository in form of presentation. The materials follow the rationale as stated by the authors.

6.32 *With other materials*—The emphasis of the program differs from most of the current social studies programs in that it is on deductive forms rather than inductive learning. They are not interdisciplinary in approach and would need to be integrated with other materials.

6.33 *With standards of analysts*—The analysts have questions about the basic approach of the program. Questions arise as to difficulty of vocabulary and content for the stated levels and to the amount of time required and the emphasis that this places on anthropology to the exclusion of other disciplines.

Rice:

Would you rewrite this section now, after teaching the unit, or would you let it stand?
It is hard to see how a unit which lasts four to five weeks takes up so much time "to the exclusion of the other disciplines." Your own content analysis, pp. 15-20, indicated that the scope of anthropology is so broad that, if anything, it incorporates many significant concepts from "other disciplines."

Conclusion

In this review of the Curriculum Materials Analysis Systems we have presented a history of the CMAS, reviewed some of the uses and applications of the system which are known to the SSEC, and given some of the background information which will help the reader understand the strengths and weaknesses of the CMAS and of the analyses now being made available. We hope that this effort will contribute to further useful interchanges among all those interested in the creation and use of better social studies materials.

CURRICULUM MATERIALS ANALYSIS SYSTEM

Summary Outline

1.0 Descriptive Characteristics
- 1.1 Media available from producer
- 1.2 Sources—author, background, institution, publisher, edition
- 1.3 Time needed for use of the materials; that is, how long does the author recommend use of the materials.
- 1.4 Style
- 1.5 Money cost
- 1.6 Availability
- 1.7 Performance data availability
- 1.8 Subject area and content
- 1.9 Dominant characteristics of curriculum forms

2.0 Rationale and Objectives
- 2.1 Rationale
  - 2.11 Goals of education with respect to the individual
  - 2.12 Goals of education with respect to society
  - 2.13 Implementation—how curriculum contributes to these goals
  - 2.14 Consistency of author's empirical and normative assumptions
- 2.2 General objectives
  - 2.21 Cognitive (main headings of Bloom taxonomy)
  - 2.22 Affective (main headings of Krathwohl taxonomy)
  - 2.23 Psychomotor skills
- 2.3 Specific objectives
  - 2.31 Cognitive (detailed Bloom taxonomy)
  - 2.32 Affective
  - 2.33 Psychomotor skills
- 2.4 Behavioral objectives

3.0 Antecedent conditions
- 3.1 Pupil characteristics (entering behavior and conditions)
  - 3.11 Sex appropriateness
  - 3.12 Ethnic orientation
  - 3.13 Age
  - 3.14 Social class
  - 3.15 Regional characteristics
  - 3.16 Special skills
  - 3.17 Achievement—aspiration
- 3.2 Teacher capabilities and requirements
- 3.3 Community
- 3.4 School
- 3.5 Articulation (external only)

4.0 Content
- 4.1 Cognitive structure
  - 4.11 Overall view of subject (apart from curriculum; *by* the author)
    - 4.111 Major concepts (or schemes, or conceptual structures, or fundamental ideas)
    - 4.112 Major processes of the discipline (s)
    - 4.113 Facts
  - 4.12 Curriculum subject content
    - 4.121 Major concepts
    - 4.122 Major processes
    - 4.123 Facts
- 4.2 Affective content
  - 4.21 Author's views of affective content of the discipline (s)
  - 4.22 Curriculum content
- 4.3 Psychomotor skills
  - 4.31 Gross muscular use, conditioning, and coordination
  - 4.32 Fine muscular use, conditioning, and coordination

5.0 Instructional theory and teaching strategies
- 5.1 Author's orientation
- 5.2 Elements of instructional theory, and their uses in teaching strategies
  - 5.21 Creation of predispositions to learning
  - 5.22 Structure and form of knowledge
  - 5.23 Ordering of content, based on theory of learning
  - 5.24 Form and pacing of reinforcement

5.3 Teaching forms, or modes, or transactions
- 5.31 Predominance of teacher-to-student action
- 5.32 Predominance of resource-to-student action
- 5.33 Predominance of teacher-student interactions
- 5.34 Predominance of student-student interactions
- 5.35 Predominance of student-resource interactions

5.4 Use of teaching forms

6.0 Overall judgments
- 6.1 Sources of descriptive data (evaluation)
- 6.2 Effects reported or predicted by sources in 6.1
- 6.3 Comparisons
- 6.4 Recommended uses

AVAILABLE CURRICULUM MATERIALS ANALYSES

Project Analyzed	Grade Level	Source of Analysis	Date Analyzed	Discipline Emphasized	Pages	Price
American Anthropological Association, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, Chicago, Illinois. CMA #28	7 & 8 Supplementary Materials	Metropolitan Area Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon.	7-68	Anthropology	17	$ .45
American Anthropological Association, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, Chicago, Illinois. CMA #76	10	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Anthropology	17	$ .45
American Anthropological Association, Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, Chicago, Illinois. CMA #7	10	Project Future, Pajara Valley Unified School District, Watsonville, California.	5-68	Anthropology	33	$ .85
American Sociological Association, Sociological Resources for Secondary Schools, Ann Arbor, Michigan. CMA #44	10 - 12 Several Selected Episodes	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	9-68	Sociology	30	$ .75
American Sociological Association, Sociological Resources for Secondary Schools, Ann Arbor, Michigan. CMA #61	10 - 12 One Episode	NDEA Summer Institute in History for Curriculum Specialists, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa.	6-68	Sociology	7	$ .20
American Sociological Association, Sociological Resources for Secondary Schools, Ann Arbor, Michigan. CMA #62	10 - 12 One Episode	NDEA Summer Institute in History for Curriculum Specialists, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa.	6-68	Sociology	7	$ .20
Association of American Geographers, High School Geography Project, Boulder, Colorado. CMA #85	10 Units I & III	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	2-69	Geography	48	$1.20
Association of American Geographers, High School Geography Project, Boulder, Colorado. CMA #52	10	NDEA Summer Institute in History for Curriculum Specialists, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa.	6-68	Geography	8	$ .20
Brentwood Public School Social Studies Project, Brentwood, New York. CMA #29	1 - 3	Metropolitan Area Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon.	7-68	Interdisciplinary	10	$ .25
California, University of, Berkeley, Asian Studies Curriculum Project, Berkeley, California. CMA #26	10	Metropolitan Area Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon.	7-68	History-Cultural Studies	11	$ .25
Carnegie-Mellon University, Social Studies Curriculum Project, Pittsburgh, Pa. CMA #83	9	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	2-69	Political Science	11	$ .25

Project Analyzed	Grade Level	Source of Analysis	Date Analyzed	Discipline Emphasized	Pages	Price
Carnegie-Mellon University, Social Studies Curriculum Project, Pittsburgh, Pa. CMA #53	9	NDEA Summer Institute in History for Curriculum Specialists, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa.	6-68	Economics	9	$ .25
Carnegie-Mellon University, Social Studies Curriculum Project, Pittsburgh, Pa. CMA #42	9	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Economics	23	$ .60
Carnegie-Mellon University, Social Studies Curriculum Project, Pittsburgh, Pa. CMA #66	9	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Economics	17	$ .45
Carnegie-Mellon University, Social Studies Curriculum Project, Pittsburgh, Pa. CMA #79	10	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	World History	13	$ .35
Carnegie-Mellon University, Social Studies Curriculum Project, Pittsburgh, Pa. CMA #81	10	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	2-69	World History	27	$ .70
Carnegie-Mellon University, Social Studies Curriculum Project, Pittsburgh, Pa. CMA #87	11	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	2-69	American History	19	$ .50
Chicago, University of, Elementary School Economics Program, Industrial Relations Center, Chicago, Illinois. CMA #36	5	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Economics	9	$ .25
Chicago, University of, Elementary School Economics Program, Industrial Relations Center, Chicago, Illinois. CMA #84	6	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	2-69	Economics	29	$ .75
Educational Development Center, Social Studies Curriculum Program, Cambridge, Mass. CMA #59	8 One Unit	NDEA Summer Institute in History for Curriculum Specialists, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa.	6-68	Political Science-History	10	$ .25
Fideler Company, Fideler Social Studies Program, Grand Rapids, Michigan. CMA #27	5 Seven Textbooks	Metropolitan Area Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon.	7-68	Interdisciplinary	21	$ .55
Follett Publishing Company, American History Study Lessons, Chicago, Illinois. CMA #13	11	Metropolitan Area Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon.	6-68	American History	9	$ .25
Georgia, University of, Anthropology Curriculum Project, Athens, Georgia. CMA #37	5	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	7-68	Anthropology	17	$ .45
Georgia University of, Anthropology Curriculum Project, Athens, Georgia. CMA #88	1 - 7	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	2-69	Anthropology	39	$1.00
Greater Cleveland Social Science Project, Cleveland, Ohio. CMA #30	3	Metropolitan Area Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon.	1968	Interdisciplinary	16	$ .40
Greater Cleveland Social Science Project, Cleveland, Ohio. CMA #80	5	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	2-69	Interdisciplinary	41	$1.05
Harvard University, Harvard Social Studies Project, Cambridge, Mass. CMA #82	9 - 12	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	9-68	Interdisciplinary	48	$1.20

Project Analyzed	Grade Level	Source of Analysis	Date Analyzed	Discipline Emphasized	Pages	Price
Harvard University, Harvard Social Studies Project, Cambridge, Mass. CMA #70	9 - 12	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Inter-disciplinary	20	$ .50
Michigan, University of, Teaching of Social Science Materials in the Elementary Schools, Ann Arbor, Michigan. CMA #67	4 - 6	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Sociology & Psychology	10	$ .25
City of New York, New York, Board of Education, *American History: Historical Development of the U.S.* CMA #2	7	Project Future, Pajaro Valley Unified School District, Watsonville, California.	7-68	Inter-disciplinary	38	$ .95
Ohio State, Economic Curriculum Materials for Secondary Schools, Now at Ohio University, Athens Ohio. CMA #6	9	Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado.	2-68	Economics	18	$ .45
Ohio State, Economic Curriculum Materials for Secondary Schools, Now at Ohio University, Athens Ohio. CMA #40	9	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Economics	17	$ .45
Ohio State, Economic Curriculum Materials for Secondary Schools, Now at Ohio University, Athens Ohio. CMA #46	9	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Economics	9	$ .25
Ohio State, Economic Curriculum Materials for Secondary Schools, Now at Ohio University, Athens Ohio. CMA #58	9	NDEA Institute in Economic Education, University of Colorado.	8-68	Economics	17	$ .45
Ohio University, Manpower Development Project, Athens, Ohio. CMA #86	8 - 9	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	2-69	Economics	24	$ .60
San Francisco State College, Taba Curriculum Development Project, San Francisco, California. CMA #24	4	Metropolitan Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon.	7-68	Inter-disciplinary	27	$ .70
San Francisco State College, Taba Curriculum Development Project, San Francisco, California. CMA #65	1 - 6	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Inter-disciplinary	17	$ .45
San Francisco State College, Taba Curriculum Development Project, San Francisco, California. CMA #77	1 - 8	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Inter-disciplinary	24	$ .60
San Jose State College, Econ 12 Project, San Jose, California. CMA #48	12	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	9-68	Economics	19	$ .50
San Jose State College, Econ 12 Project, San Jose, California. CMA #50	12	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Economics	18	$ .45
Science Research Associates, *Our Working World,* Chicago, Illinois. CMA #31	1	Metropolitan Area Curriculum Center, Milwaukie, Oregon.	7-68	Economics-Inter-disciplinary	17	$ .45
Science Research Associates, *Our Working World,* Chicago, Illinois. CMA #33	3	Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program, University of Colorado.	8-68	Economics-Inter-disciplinary	31	$ .80

Project Analyzed	Grade Level	Source of Analysis	Date Analyzed	Discipline Emphasized	Pages	Price
Washington University, Development of a Model for the St. Louis Metropolitan Social Studies Center, St. Louis, Missouri. CMA #57	4	NDEA Institute in History for Curriculum Specialists, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pa.	6-68	Inter-disciplinary	9	$ .25
Curriculum Analysis System: "Steps in Curriculum Analysis," Stevens & Morrissett. Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado.					16	$ .40

BOULDER OFFICE STAFF

Irving Morrissett, Executive Director
W. Williams Stevens, Jr., Assistant Director
Marcia Hutson, Administrative Assistant

Staff Associates

James E. Davis
James O. Hodges
Merle M. Knight
Richard Van Scotter
Celeste P. Woodley

Teacher Associates

Rosemary Barker
Ronald Stadsklev

Single copies of the newsletter are available on request. Multiple copies may be ordered at 10 cents per copy.

SSEC

1424 15th STREET
BOULDER,
COLORADO 80302